

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/065,275	Applicant(s) WHEELER, MATTHEW G.	
	Examiner Charles G. Freay	Art Unit 3746	

All Participants:

(1) Charles G. Freay.

(2) Mark L. Gleason.

Date of Interview: 14 September 2005

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
13

Prior art documents discussed:
Snodgrass et al (USPN 6,109,881)

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11:00 AM

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The amendment of August 7, 2006 amended claim 1 to include the material of claim 13. The applicant noted that claim 13 had not been addressed. The examiner noted that claim 13 should have been included in the rejection under Snodgrass et al. The examiner further noted that the method of claim 21 was allowable and stated that if the structural pump of this claim were presented it would be found allowable. The applicant and the examiner agreed upon new claim 29 as presented in the examiner's amendment..